# Study of the $f_2(1270)$ and $a_2(1320)$ resonances in $\gamma^*(Q^2)\gamma$ collisions

N. N. Achasov, A. V. Kiselev, and G. N. Shestakov
*Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, S. L. Sobolev Institute for Mathematics, 630090 Novosibirsk, Russia*

We discuss studies of the $Q^2$ dependence of the $f_2(1270)$ and $a_2(1320)$ production cross sections in $\gamma^*(Q^2)\gamma$ collisions at current and coming into operation colliders with a high luminosity. Changing the dominant helicity amplitude occurs in the reactions $\gamma^*(Q^2)\gamma \to f_2(1270)$ and $\gamma^*(Q^2)\gamma \to a_2(1320)$ with increasing $Q^2$. This is caused by the coming of the QCD asymptotics. It is shown that the transition to the asymptotic behavior of QCD in the amplitudes $\gamma^*(Q^2)\gamma \to f_2(1270), a_2(1320)$ is provided by the compensation of the contributions of ground vector states $\rho$ and $\omega$ in $Q^2$-channel with the contributions of their radial excitations.

PACS numbers: 13.40.Gp, 13.60.Le, 13.66.Jn

arXiv:1509.09150v2 [hep-ph] 9 Dec 2015

Physics of two-photons collisions entering into the era of ultra-high statistics gives unique opportunities to study the internal (quark-gluon) structure of hadrons [1–4]. For example, the recent experiments of the Belle Collaboration on the reactions $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-$ [5, 6], $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\pi^0$ [7], and $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\eta$ [8] established conclusively the smallness of the two-photon widths of the $f_0(980)$ and $a_0(980)$ resonances, which testifies in favor of their four-quark structure [9–11]. [1]

The measurements of the two-photon widths of the light pseudoscalar mesons $P = \pi^0,\ \eta,\ \eta'$ in $\gamma\gamma$ collisions [1] and the transition form factors $F_{\gamma^*\gamma\to P}(Q^2)$ in $\gamma^*(Q^2)\gamma$ collisions [2] performed by CELLO [12], CLEO [13], BaBar [14, 15] and Belle [16] Collaborations allowed to realize a critical test of QCD calculations of the processes at large $Q^2$.

Production of classical tensor $q\bar{q}$ resonances by two real photons proceeds very intensively: $f_2(1270)$ in the reactions $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-$ [5, 6, 17, 18] and $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\pi^0$ [7, 19] and $a_2(1320)$ in the reactions $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\eta$ [8, 20] and $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ [21–25] (see Fig. 1). This fact is a good reason to start detailed investigations of the $Q^2$ dependence of the $f_2(1270)$ and $a_2(1320)$ production cross sections in $\gamma^*\gamma$ collisions at $e^+e^-$ colliders with a high luminosity. [3]

We now turn to the detailed discussion.

In $\gamma\gamma$ collisions, the $f_2(1270)$ and $a_2(1320)$ resonances can be produced in the states with helicity $\lambda = 0$ and $\pm 2$. Helicity $\lambda$ is defined in the resonance rest frame, in which $\lambda = \lambda_1 - \lambda_2$, where $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$ are the helicities of incoming photons. According to the high-statistics measurements [6–8, 17–19, 23–25] the fraction of the $f_2(1270)$ and $a_2(1320)$ production in states with $\lambda = \pm 2$ in $\gamma\gamma$ collisions is more than 95%.




Figure 1: Cross sections of the reactions (a) $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-$ [5, 6, 17, 18], (b) $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\pi^0$ [7, 19], (c) $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\eta$ [8], and (d) $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ [23] as functions of the invariant mass, $\sqrt{s}$, of the final meson system. In plots (a)–(c) $\theta$ denotes the polar angle of one of the outgoing mesons with respect to the incident photon direction in the $\gamma\gamma$ center-of-mass system. The reactions $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\pi^0$, plot (b), and $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$, plot (d), seem more preferable in the sense of the smallness of the physical background under the $f_2(1270)$ and $a_2(1320)$ peaks, respectively.

This remarkable experimental fact of $\lambda = \pm 2$ dominance is naturally reproduced by the effective gauge-invariant Lagrangian, describing the tensor meson production by two photons with opposite helicities only

[1] In 1982, the prediction $\Gamma(f_0(980) \to \gamma\gamma) \approx \Gamma(a_0(980) \to \gamma\gamma) \approx 0.27$ keV was done in the four-quark MIT bag model [9, 10]. In 2014, the Particle Data Group cited in the Review of Particle Physics the following data [1]: $\Gamma(f_0(980) \to \gamma\gamma) \approx 0.29$ keV and $\Gamma(a_0(980) \to \gamma\gamma) \approx 0.3$ keV, which is an order of magnitude smaller than the $\gamma\gamma$ width of the tensor $q\bar{q}$ meson $\Gamma(f_2(1270) \to \gamma\gamma) \approx 3$ keV. The prediction of the $q\bar{q}$ model $\Gamma(f_0(980) \to \gamma\gamma)/\Gamma(a_0(980) \to \gamma\gamma) = 25/9$ is excluded experimentally.

[2] $\gamma^*(Q^2)$ ($\gamma^*$ below) denotes the photon with virtuality $-Q^2$.

[3] Currently, the maximum luminosity $\approx 2 \cdot 10^{34}$ cm$^{-2} \cdot c^{-1}$ is reached at the KEKB $e^+e^-$ collider [1, 4]. The luminosity of $8 \cdot 10^{35}$ cm$^{-2} \cdot c^{-1}$ is planned to have at the SuperKEKB factory [1, 3].

[10, 26, 27],

$$L = g_{T\gamma\gamma} T_{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\sigma} F_{\nu\sigma}\,, \qquad (1)$$

where $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu$ is the tensor of the electromagnetic field $A_\mu$, $T_{\mu\nu}$ is the field of the tensor meson $T$ ($T = f_2(1270)$, $a_2(1320)$); $T_{\mu\nu} = T_{\nu\mu}$, $T_{\mu\mu} = 0$, $\partial_\mu T_{\mu\nu} = 0$; $g_{T\gamma\gamma}$ is the coupling constants of the $T$ meson to the energy-momentum tensor of the electromagnetic field.

Using Lagrangian (1) one can unambiguously predict the hierarchy of the $Q^2$ dependencies of the helicity amplitudes $V^{(\lambda)}_{\lambda_1,\lambda_2}(T;\, s, Q^2) = V^{(-\lambda)}_{-\lambda_1,-\lambda_2}(T;\, s, Q^2)$ describing the $\gamma^*\gamma \to T$ vertices [26, 28]:

$$V^{(2)}_{1,-1}(T;\, s, Q^2) = V_T(s, Q^2)\left(1 + \frac{Q^2}{s}\right), \qquad (2)$$

$$V^{(1)}_{1,0}(T;\, s, Q^2) = V_T(s, Q^2)\sqrt{\frac{Q^2}{2s}}\left(1 + \frac{Q^2}{s}\right), \qquad (3)$$

$$V^{(0)}_{1,1}(T;\, s, Q^2) = -V_T(s, Q^2)\frac{Q^2}{\sqrt{6}s}\left(1 + \frac{Q^2}{s}\right). \qquad (4)$$

Here $s = (q_1 + q_2)^2$; $q_1$ and $q_2$ are the four-momenta of the incident photons, $q_1^2 = 0$, $q_2^2 = -Q^2$;

$$V_T(s, Q^2) = g_{T\gamma\gamma}\, s\, F_T(Q^2)/2, \quad F_T(0) = 1, \qquad (5)$$

$$g_{T\gamma\gamma}\, s = 2V^{(2)}_{1,-1}(T;\, s, 0) = \sqrt{320\,\pi\,\sqrt{s}\,\Gamma_{T\to\gamma\gamma}(s)}, \qquad (6)$$

and $F_T(Q^2)$ is the transition form factor which is common for all vertices.

The vertex $V^{(1)}_{1,0}(T;\, s, Q^2)$ vanishes for $Q^2 \to 0$ as $\sqrt{Q^2}$. This is a consequence of gauge invariance. The vertex $V^{(0)}_{1,1}(T;\, s, Q^2)$ is proportional to $Q^2$ for $Q^2 \to 0$ owing to a specific selection of the $\gamma^*\gamma\, T$ interaction which consists with the experimental fact of $\lambda = \pm 2$ dominance in $\gamma\gamma \to T$ transitions (see $V^{(2)}_{1,-1}(T;\, s, 0)$ in Eq. (6)).

For small $Q^2$, the dominance of $V^{(2)}_{1,-1}(T;\, s, Q^2)$ over $V^{(1)}_{1,0}(T;\, s, Q^2)$ and $V^{(0)}_{1,1}(T;\, s, Q^2)$ is certainly maintained. However, for large $Q^2$ the situation changes radically. Asymptotically

$$V^{(2)}_{1,-1}(T;\, s, Q^2) \sim F_T(Q^2)\, Q^2, \qquad (7)$$

$$V^{(1)}_{1,0}(T;\, s, Q^2) \sim F_T(Q^2)\, Q^3, \qquad (8)$$

$$V^{(0)}_{1,1}(T;\, s, Q^2) \sim F_T(Q^2)\, Q^4 \qquad (9)$$

and the $\gamma^*\gamma \to T$ vertex with $\lambda = 0$ becomes dominant.




Figure 2: The $Q^2$ dependencies of the normalized vertex functions $2|V^{(\lambda)}_{\lambda_1,\lambda_2}(T;\, m_T^2, Q^2)|/(g_{T\gamma\gamma} m_T^2)$ calculated according to Eqs. (2)–(6) and (10). For the $f_2(1270)$ and $a_2(1320)$ resonances these dependencies practically coincide because $m_{f_2} \approx m_{a_2}$.

From the parton model considerations [29] and the QCD analysis of hard exclusive processes [30, 31] it follows that for large $Q^2$ the tensor meson production amplitude with zero helicity (in the $\gamma^*\gamma$ center-of-mass system) should tend to the constant value (with logarithmic accuracy), and other amplitudes should be suppressed by powers of $Q^2$. This implies that $F_T(Q^2) \sim 1/Q^4$ for large $Q^2$. In the generalized vector meson dominance model (GVDM) such an asymptotic behavior is provided by the compensation in $Q^2$-channel of the contributions of ground and excited states of vector mesons $V = \rho, \omega, \phi$, $V' = \rho', \omega', \phi'$, $V'' = \rho'', \omega'', \phi''$, etc. [28].

It is interesting to find out, at least roughly, how fast the angular distributions can vary with $Q^2$ in the reactions $\gamma^*\gamma \to f_2(1270) \to \pi\pi$, $\gamma^*\gamma \to a_2(1320) \to \pi^0\eta$, and $\gamma^*\gamma \to a_2(1320) \to \rho^\pm\pi^\mp \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ for $0 < Q^2 < 40$ GeV$^2$ (in the case of the processes $\gamma^*\gamma \to \pi^0$, $\eta$, $\eta'$ the asymptotic regime apparently occurs near 40 GeV$^2$).

We put $m_\rho = m_\omega$, $m_{\rho'} = m_{\omega'}$, etc., and will consider that the resonance $f_2(1270)$ does not contain strange valent quarks (as $\omega$, $\omega'$, etc.). Then, in GVDM, a simplest expression for $F_T(Q^2)$ with the required asymptotic behavior has the form

$$F_T(Q^2) = \frac{1}{(1 + Q^2/m_\rho^2)(1 + Q^2/m_{\rho'}^2)}. \qquad (10)$$

Figure 2 shows the $Q^2$ dependencies of the normalized vertex functions $2|V^{(\lambda)}_{\lambda_1,\lambda_2}(T;\, m_T^2, Q^2)|/(g_{T\gamma\gamma} m_T^2)$ calculated according Eqs. (2)–(6) and (10) at $m_\rho = 0.775$ GeV, $m_{\rho'} = 1.465$ GeV, and $s = m_T^2$. As is seen from Fig. 2, the main at $Q^2 = 0$ vertex function with helicity $\lambda = 2$ decreases very rapidly with increasing $Q^2$. For $Q^2 \gtrsim 10$ GeV$^2$ the vertex function with helicity $\lambda = 0$ be-

comes main and close to its asymptotic value.

The angular distributions in the reactions $\gamma^*\gamma \to f_2(1270) \to \pi\pi$ [26], $\gamma^*\gamma \to a_2(1320) \to \pi^0\eta$, and $\gamma^*\gamma \to a_2(1320) \to \rho^\pm\pi^\mp \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ reshape as $Q^2$ increases with the same rate.

The differential cross sections for $\gamma^*\gamma \to f_2(1270) \to \pi\pi$ and $\gamma^*\gamma \to a_2(1320) \to \pi^0\eta$ (integrated over the azimuth angle of one of the outgoing mesons in the $\gamma^*\gamma$ center-of-mass system) have the following form: $\sin^4\theta$ for the tensor meson decays from the helicity $\lambda = \pm 2$ states, $4\cos^2\theta\sin^2\theta$ for $\lambda = \pm 1$, and $\frac{2}{3}(3\cos^2\theta - 1)^2$ for $\lambda = 0$, where $\theta$ is the polar angle of one of the outgoing mesons. These angular distributions are equally normalized. Thus, the $\sin^4\theta$ distribution dominating at $Q^2 = 0$ should be replaced by the $\frac{2}{3}(3\cos^2\theta - 1)^2$ distribution with increasing $Q^2$.

The amplitude of the reaction $\gamma^*\gamma \to a_2(1320) \to \rho^\pm\pi^\mp \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ is described by two diagrams and therefore the corresponding angular distributions for $\lambda = \pm 2$, $\pm 1$, and 0 have a rather cumbersome form. Nevertheless these distributions are sensitive to the $a_2(1320)$ helicity $\lambda$. They are exhaustively represented in Refs. [21–25]. Here we consider as an example the contribution of one diagram $\gamma^*\gamma \to a_2(1320) \to \rho^+\pi^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ only. Then the angular distributions (integrated over the azimuth angle of the outgoing $\pi^-$ meson) corresponding to the $\lambda = \pm 2$, $\pm 1$, and 0 helicity contributions are

$$\sin^2\theta_{\rho^+}\sin^2\theta_{\pi^+}(\cos^2\theta_{\rho^+}\sin^2\varphi_{\pi^+} + \cos^2\varphi_{\pi^+}), \quad (11)$$

$$\sin^2\theta_{\pi^+}[\sin^2\varphi_{\pi^+}(2\cos^2\theta_{\rho^+} - 1)^2 + \cos^2\varphi_{\pi^+}\cos^2\theta_{\rho^+}], \quad (12)$$

$$6\sin^2\theta_{\rho^+}\sin^2\theta_{\pi^+}\cos^2\theta_{\rho^+}\sin^2\varphi_{\pi^+}, \quad (13)$$

respectively, where $\theta_{\rho^+}$ is the polar angle of the $\rho^+$ in the $\gamma^*\gamma$ center-of-mass system, with the z-axis along the incident photon direction; the angles $\theta_{\pi^+}$ and $\varphi_{\pi^+}$ describe the decay of the $\rho^+$ in its helicity system; $\varphi_{\pi^+}$ is measured from the plane defined by the momenta of the $\rho^+$ and photons. As $Q^2$ increases, the distribution from Eq. (11) should be replaced by that from Eq. (13).

Note that the form factors of a more general form than that in Eq. (10) may be required for the treatment of real data, for example,

$$F_T(Q^2) = \frac{1 + \xi Q^2}{(1 + Q^2/m_\rho^2)(1 + Q^2/m_{\rho'}^2)(1 + Q^2/m_{\rho''}^2)} \quad (14)$$

with varying masses $m_{\rho'}$ and $m_{\rho''}$ and an additional free parameter $\xi$.

Deviations from the above picture are possible in principle since the tensor meson production in $\gamma^*\gamma$ collisions can be described in the general case by three independent invariant amplitudes. However, our scenario is based on the well-established dominance of the $\lambda = \pm 2$ helicity states in the tensor meson production by two real photons. This allows us to hope that possible deviations will be small.

Thus, the experiments on the reactions $\gamma^*\gamma \to f_2(1270)$ and $\gamma^*\gamma \to a_2(1320)$ will allow to check the theoretical predictions about the changing of the dominant helicity amplitude with increasing $Q^2$. The dynamics of this change can be tracked by analyzing the angular distributions of the final mesons in the reactions $\gamma^*\gamma \to f_2(1270) \to \pi\pi$, $\gamma^*\gamma \to a_2(1320) \to \pi^0\eta$, and $\gamma^*(Q^2)\gamma \to a_2(1320) \to \rho^\pm\pi^\mp \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$. The information obtained on three transition form factors, corresponding to the $\lambda = 2$, 1, and 0 $\gamma^*\gamma$ helicity amplitudes, would be crucial for the selection of dynamical models of the $f_2(1270)$ and $a_2(1320)$ resonance production.

We have shown that the transition to the asymptotic behavior of QCD in the amplitudes $\gamma^*(Q^2)\gamma \to f_2(1270), a_2(1320)$ is provided by the compensation of the contributions of ground vector states $\rho$ and $\omega$ in $Q^2$-channel with those of their radial excitations.

More recently, the Belle Collaboration represented the first data on the processes $\gamma^*(Q^2)\gamma \to f_2(1270)$ extracted from the measured differential cross section of the reaction $\gamma^*\gamma \to f_2(1270) \to \pi^0\pi^0$ for $Q^2$ up to 30 GeV$^2$ [32]. In Fig. 3, the curves transferred from Fig. 2 are compared with the Belle data which we multiplied by a factor $(1 + Q^2/m_{f_2}^2)$ in order to match the definition of the transition form factors with $\lambda = 2$, 1, and 0 used in Ref. [32] with our definition of the normalized vertex functions. The theoretical curves are in satisfactory agreement with the data.

The present work is partially supported by the RFBR grant No. 13-02-00039 and by the Interdisciplinary project No. 102 of the Siberian Branch of RAS.

[1] K.A. Olive, K. Agashe, C. Amsler et al. (Particle Data Group), Chin. Phys. C **38**, 090001 (2014).
[2] D.M. Asner, T. Barnes, J.M. Bian et al. (BESIII Collab.), Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **24**, S1 (2009).
[3] T. Aushev, W. Bartel, A. Bondar et al. (SuperKEKB/Belle II Collab.), arXiv:1002.5012.
[4] A.J. Bevan, B. Golob, Th. Mannel et al. (BaBar and Belle Collab.), Eur. Phys. J. C **74**, 3026 (2014).
[5] T. Mori, S. Uehara, Y. Watanabe et al. (Belle Collab.), Phys. Rev. D **75**, 051101(R) (2007).




Figure 3: Comparison of the $Q^2$ dependencies of the normalized vertex functions $2|V^{(\lambda)}_{\lambda_1,\lambda_2}(f_2(1270);\, m^2_{f_2}, Q^2)|/(g_{f_2\gamma\gamma} m^2_{f_2})$, calculated according to Eqs. (2)–(6) and (10), with the Belle data. [32]. The curves are the same as in Fig. 2. The Belle data are reduced to our normalization.


[6] T. Mori, S. Uehara, Y. Watanabe et al. (Belle Collab.), J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **76**, 074102 (2007).

[7] S. Uehara, Y. Watanabe, I. Adachi et al. (Belle Collab.), Phys. Rev. D **78**, 052004 (2008).

[8] S. Uehara, Y. Watanabe, H. Nakazawa et al. (Belle Collab.), Phys. Rev. D **80**, 032001 (2009).

[9] N.N. Achasov, S.A. Devyanin, and G.N. Shestakov, Phys. Lett. **108 B** , 134 (1982).

[10] N.N. Achasov, S.A. Devyanin, and G.N. Shestakov, Z. Phys. C **16**, 55 (1982).

[11] N.N. Achasov, G.N. Shestakov, Physics–Uspekhi **54**, 799 (2011) [Usp. Fiz. Nauk **181**, 827 (2011)].

[12] H.-J. Behrend, L. Criegee, T.H. Field et al. (CELLO Collab.), Z. Phys. C **49**, 401 (1991).

[13] J. Gronberg, T.S. Hill, R. Kutschke et al. (CLEO Collab.), Phys. Rev. D **57**, 33 (1998).

[14] B. Aubert, Y. Karyotakis, J.P. Lees et al. (BaBar Collab.), Phys. Rev. D **80**, 052002 (2009).

[15] P. del Amo Sanchez, J.P. Lees, V. Poireau et al. (BaBar Collab.), Phys. Rev. D **84**, 052001 (2011).

[16] S. Uehara, Y. Watanabe, H. Nakazawa et al. (Belle Collab.), Phys. Rev. D **86**, 092007 (2012).

[17] J. Boyer, F. Butler, G. Gidal et al. (Mark II Collab.), Phys. Rev. D **42**, 1350 (1990).

[18] H.-J. Behrend, L.Criegee, T.H. Field et al. (CELLO Collab.), Z. Phys. C **56**, 381 (1992).

[19] H. Marsiske, D. Antriasyan, H.W. Bartels et al. (Crystal Ball Collab.), Phys. Rev. D **41**, 3324 (1990).

[20] D. Antreasyn, D. Aschman, D. Besset et al. (Crystal Ball Collab.), Phys. Rev. D **33**, 1847 (1986).

[21] Ch. Berger, A. Deuter, H. Genzel et al. (PLUTO Collab.), Phys. Lett. **149 B**, 427 (1984).

[22] S.E. Baru, A.E. Blinov, V.T. Blinov et al. (MD-1 Collab.), Z. Phys. C **48**, 581 (1990).

[23] H. Albreht, T. Hamacher, R.P. Hofmann et al. (ARGUS Collab.), Z. Phys. C **74**, 469 (1997).

[24] M. Acciarri, O. Adriani, M. Anuilar-Btnitez et al. (L3 Collab.), Phys. Lett. B **413**, 147 (1997).

[25] K. Abe, K. Abe, I. Adachi et al. (Belle Collab.), arXiv:hep-ex/0610022.

[26] N.N. Achasov and V.A. Karnakov, Z. Phys. C **30**, 141 (1986).

[27] N.N. Achasov, A.I. Goncharenko, A.V. Kiselev, and E.V. Rogozina, Phys. Rev. D **88**, 114001 (2013); Phys. Rev. D **89**, 059906(E) (2014).

[28] N.N. Achasov, A.V. Kiselev, and G.N. Shestakov, arXiv:1504.07346.

[29] G. Köpp, T.F. Walsh, and P. Zerwas, Nucl. Phys. B **70**, 461 (1974).

[30] V.L. Chernyak and A.R. Zhitnitsky, Phys. Rep. **112**, 173 (1984).

[31] V.N. Baier and A.G. Grozin, Sov. J. Part. Nucl. **16**, 1 (1985) [Fiz. Elem. Chast. At. Yad. **16**, 5 (1985)].

[32] M. Masuda, S. Uehara, Y. Watanabe et al. (Belle Collab.), arXiv:1508.06757.